

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-8, and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,005,600 to Hill. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Hill in view of U.S. patent 6,845,398 to Galensky et al. (herein “Galensky”). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Hill in view of U.S. patent 6,507,672 to Watkins et al. (herein “Watkins”). Claims 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Hill.

Addressing the above-noted rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Initially, applicants note each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now clarifies “the predetermined range being set based on an operation mode being one of a normal speed mode, a high speed mode higher than the normal speed mode, or a pause mode”. The other independent claims recite similar features.

In the claimed features, and with reference to Figure 2 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, a digital television monitor 32 includes a buffer 56 and a control circuit 54. The digital television monitor 32 receives image data from a recording device 31. According to the claimed features, the buffer 56 stores screens or frames of image data from the recorder 31. One benefit realized by the operation in the claimed invention is that real-time playback can be enhanced by utilizing such a buffer 56. To realize that operation, in the claimed invention the control circuit 54 requests a specific amount of data to be sent from the recorder 31 based on an operation mode of the digital television monitor 32. For example, in a normal speed playback mode the control circuit 54 requests that 15 frames forwardly and backwardly adjacent to a noticed frame be sent from the recorder 31, in a high speed mode

frames for 5 minutes of forward and backward data from a noticed frame are requested to be sent, and in a pause mode 30 successive frames forwardly and backwardly from a noticed frame are requested to be sent. The above-noted subject matter is discussed in the specification at page 30, line 5 to page 32, line 1.

Thereby, in the claimed invention the predetermined range of forward and backward screens from a noticed screen requested to be sent to the control section 54 varies and is set based on whether the image processing apparatus is in a normal speed mode, a high speed mode, or a pause mode. Such features as clarified in the claims are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

Hill is cited in the Office Action to disclose a control section 114 that issues a request for image data of screens with a predetermined forward and backward range.

Hill discloses monitoring a buffer fill level as a way to control a number of requested frames.<sup>1</sup> In that way, Hill differs from the claims as currently written. In the claims as currently written the number of screens requested by the control section is not based on the fill level of the buffer 56, but instead is based on the operation mode being one of a normal speed mode, a high speed mode, or a pause mode. In the non-limiting example discussed above a different number of screens is requested to be issued based on the operation mode. That feature is believed to be neither taught nor suggested by Hill which basis such a request on a fill level of a buffer

In such ways, the claims as currently written are believed to distinguish over Hill.

Further, the teachings in the further cited references to Galensky and Watkins are not believed to cure the above-discussed deficiencies in Hill.

In view of these foregoing comments, the claims as currently written are believed to distinguish over the applied art.

---

<sup>1</sup> See for example Hill at column 8, line 58 *et seq.*

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)  
SNS/rac

I:\ATTY\SNS\27's\275769\275769US-AF.DOC